



UPPER CANADA DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
Capital Education Centre
PO Box 220, Oxford Mills, ON K0G 1S0
613 258-9393/1-888-402-3522
Fax: 613 258-6321

UPPER CANADA DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD SPEECH-LANGUAGE REASSESSMENT REPORT

Name:	Date of Birth:
School:	Grade:
Date of Evaluation:	Chronological age:

Confidential and Without Prejudice

- # This report is written solely for educational purposes. Due to the developing and changing nature of children, the information and recommendations included in this report are meant for current use. Reference to or use of this report in the future should be made with considerable caution.
- # This report is to remain in the Ontario Student Record (OSR) at all times, even if the student moves to another school board
- # Formal test scores are reported in terms of standard scores. A raw score (e.g. 14/15) is converted into a standard score so students of the same age can be compared together. Composite standard scores range from below 50 to around 150 with 100 being the average score. A standard score which is above 85 would be average. A standard score falling below 85 would indicate a need for support. Subtest standard scores ranges from 1 to 15 with 10 being average. A standard score which is above 7 would be average, while a standard score falling below 7 would indicate a need for support.

REFERRAL INFORMATION:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The following represents a summary of some of the pertinent background information. For a complete review of all past assessments and agency involvement please refer to XXX's Ontario School Record (OSR).

TESTING	YES	NO	
Hearing Test:			Results:
Vision Test:			Results:
Speech Language Assessment:			Results:
Occupational Therapy:			Results:
Physiotherapy:			Results:
Psychometric Assessment:			Results:
Other:			Results:

ASSESSMENT MEASURES:

Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals- Fourth Edition (CELF-4)
Renfrew Action Picture Test (RAPT)
Informal Observation

RESULTS:

AREA	COMMENTS
------	----------

Behaviour/Social Language	
Vocabulary	
Language Comprehension	
Language Expression	
Literacy	

SS= Standard Score %ile=Percentile AE=Age Equivalent Score

COMMENTS / SUMMARY:

In summary,

Based on assessment results, the following recommendations were discussed with XXX's family and school personnel:

- 1) Programming for home and school is attached to this report. If further programming and/or assessment is required, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned clinician.
- 2) XXXX continue with direct language intervention through a Speech-Language Assistant under the supervision of a regional Speech-language Pathologist.
- 3) XX's hearing should be assessed by an Audiologist.
- 4) The attached list of equipment is deemed essential for XXXX to be able to access the curriculum and to achieve the goals outlined in his Individual Education Plan (IEP) as well as for XX to achieve an optimal level of inclusion and to participate fully in all learning experiences in XX classroom including group instruction. Please refer to the attached Program Plan for an explanation on how this equipment will be used to meet XXX's needs.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me directly at the Upper Canada District School Board Capital Region Education Centre at (613) 258-9393 or 1-888-402-3522, extension 2524.

Alexandra H. M. Dunn, M.Cl.Sc.
Speech Language Pathologist
Reg. CASLPO #3061

C.c. Family
XXX Public School – Ontario School Record (O.S.R.)
Central File

PROGRAMMING SUGGESTIONS

Educational Expectations	Accommodations/Modifications/Strategies/ Resources

To help XXXX reach current speech, language and communication goals as outlined in his Individual Education Plan (IEP), the application of a multi-modal/multi-media approach has been recommended applying a higher level application of the related approaches known as Participation Model, Aided Language Stimulation, Natural Aided Language, Environmental Communication Teaching, facilitated language and Differentiated Instruction (Differentiated Communication):

1. Aided Language Stimulation (Goossens, Crain and Elder, 1992) is a strategy used to build a student's understanding of vocabulary, concepts, grammar as well as to build the child's awareness of communication. In Aided Language Stimulation, the communication partners communicate to the student using visual support methods – **sending and receiving** messages supported by AAC.

2. The Participation Model - Why fully integrate students with disabilities into the classroom? So that they are not only included in regular classroom activities, but are also *active participants* in learning academic content in relevant areas (reading, spelling, writing, math, PE, music etc.); they have opportunities to form social relationships and friendships with peers; and they acquire relevant, functional skills in non-academic areas. *The goal for all students is meaningful educational and social participation.* Much of the time, students who use AAC can participate in the same classroom activities as their typical peers AND do work that meets their individual learning needs and goals - inclusion without participation is not inclusion at all. This is the essence of inclusive education and the philosophy behind the Participation Model originally developed by Rosenberg and Beukelman (1988); revised by Beukelman and Mirenda¹. This is a collaborative model that includes teachers, educational assistants, professional services staff, students and parents in setting academic and social goals. Collaboration is student-centred, goal focused, and process-oriented. Tools and technology are useful *relative to goals*. Technological assists, like interactive whiteboards (SMART Boards), can be used as one tool in a classroom committed to inclusion and universal design while meeting the needs of students with exceptional learning needs. Additionally, technological assists can be leveraged to promote inclusive classroom practices.

3. Natural Aided Language Stimulation - An enhancement of the Aided Language Stimulation approach is Natural Aided Language which "...is an augmentative communication strategy in which visual symbols (either icons or words) are placed on an environmentally specific language board or technology device for the purpose of facilitating interaction and participation in an activity." (Cafiero). Joanne M. Cafiero (www.outersound.com/cafero/articles) expands on the application of Natural Aided Language.

...in Natural Aided Language, the visual language is viewed as a legitimate and real language and every activity, environment and potential communicative need is interfaced with a visual language board with or without an AAC device. As a real and legitimate language, every person in the child's environment takes responsibility for using the language and implementing the board. The child ... is exposed to this language by his family, peers and professional helpers, thereby receiving intense receptive language stimulation with the expectation, without pressure, that expressive language (with or without AAC support) will eventually occur.

4. Differentiated Communication/Facilitation of Language – In-class "immersion" or imbedding of strategies to facilitate development of the student's communication skills focusing on not only development of vocabulary, grammar and concepts but also on the non-verbal aspects of language and communication. Adept conversational partners naturally shift and adapt communication styles depending on the situation. They also shift communication patterns across a range of partners and social contexts. These shifts are evidenced by changes in choice of vocabulary, complexity of syntax, vocal pitch, and modifications of nonverbal patterns such as proximity, gesture and facial expression. Style shifts may involve

nothing more than lowering one's voice in a library or be as complex as the many sensitive adjustments needed for a successful job interview.... (Hoskins, Barbara in Conversations: A Framework for Language Intervention, Thinking Publications 1996).

5. Classroom Performance Analysis and Intervention - In considering programming for XXX, we need to consider the communication demands of the classroom for students. Wiig, Secord, Glaser, Sotto and Prendeville have considered the communication demands of the existing Ontario curriculum.

6. Social Pragmatic Language Support - We are now recognizing the tremendous impact of social/pragmatic language difficulties on classroom learning.

...language intervention involves more than teaching rules of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. It is also more than teaching the rules of pragmatics, or use of language in social contexts. All of these aspects of language must be brought together to use language effectively in conversation. (Hoskins, Barbara in Conversations: A Framework for Language Intervention, Thinking Publications 1996). If language is learned in interaction (Bruner, 1975), it may be important that we design language intervention so that language learners can use language to communicate with others in authentic interchanges. With this in mind, group settings are more conducive to language learning than individual settings. (Hoskins, Barbara in Conversations: A Framework for Language Intervention, Thinking Publications 1996).

Proposal: Request for assistive technology and materials including a SMARTBoard installed in XXX classroom.

XXXX and the teaching staff will require supportive technology/material/resources to assist XXX in making optimal progress.

Using a combination of computer technology, software and materials, the teaching staff will be able to create a multi-media language immersion context to integrate communication programming into the everyday curriculum activities. In addition to the more commonly recommended technology and materials, I have also recommended that a SMARTBoard will be an essential and critical tool to support XXXX in accessing the curriculum in the classroom context.

The SMARTBOARD would allow the teaching staff to use Classroom Suite, Picture Communication Symbols and other visual supports to assist XXXX in:

1. building XXX comprehension of oral and graphic language,
2. building XXX self expression through oral and graphic language, and
3. expanding XXXX world knowledge through better accessing of the curriculum.

Rationale: The SMARTBoard would allow the teaching staff and peers to actively communicate with XXXX using visual supports both to communicate to XXX and to receive information from XXX.
--

The recommendation of the SMARTBoard is to allow for creation of an immersion situation where teaching staff and peers would utilize the augmentative/visual support systems to communicate to XXXX (optimizing his understanding) as well as to messages of increased length and complexity from XXX. The goal is to implement the higher level strategies of Aided Language Stimulation/Natural Aided Language, the Participation Model, Language Facilitation, Differentiated Communication, Classroom Performance Intervention and Social Pragmatic Language Support into XXXX classroom.

The focus of XXX program redesign is to better support XXX's active involvement in the regular curriculum – building XXX knowledge, literacy, and numeracy skills while optimizing XXXX ability to communicate with both familiar and less familiar partners about a broader range of topics and for a wider range of purposes.

Based on the Goossens' model of engineering the classroom, we would essentially be applying XXX strategies but using the modern technology of the SMARTBoard.

The combination of the computer, SMARTBoard, and software would allow XXX teaching staff and peers to communicate **to** XXXX and **receive** XXXX messages about the topics discussed in the larger group context. It would allow XXXX and XXXX class to converse. Teaching staff could prepare lessons which optimize:

- I. XXX use of multi-media/visual strategies to build XXX weak receptive and expressive language skills,
- II. XXX ability to work around XXX speech, receptive and expressive language struggles to assist XXX in confirming, questioning, working in groups within the classroom curriculum activities.
- III. XXX ability to work around XXX speech, receptive and expressive language struggles to assist XXX in completing classroom assessments.

XXXX is presently enrolled in a regular Grade 2 class. The SMARTBoard with computer and software would allow not only XXXX but also XXX classmates to receive language and curriculum input through multi-sensory support.

This would include:

- auditory (the teacher/instructor's speech/voice, speech output from computer, music, sound effects),
- visual (picture communication symbols/printed word, photos, graphics – on SMARTBoard), and
- proprioceptive (touching, adding to and moving information on the SMARTBoard).

For example, the teacher could introduce animals and discuss their various characteristics. The students could then physically/visually/verbally discuss the grouping of these animals into mammals, reptiles, etc. The students could hear the teacher name the items, see the Picture Communication Symbols/photos, and could participate in learning how those animals are grouped by characteristics. They could then practice the categorization of the animal groups by physically moving the pictured items into groupings on the SMARTBoard.

References:

Beukelman, D., and Mirenda, P. (1998). *Augmentative and alternative communication: Management of severe communication disorders in children and adults (2nd ed.)*, Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Goossens, C., Crain, S., and Elder, P. (1992) Engineering the preschool environment for interactive, symbolic communication. Birmingham, AL: Southeast Augmentative Communication Conference Publications.

Kutscher, M. Kids in the Syndrome Mix of ADHD, LD, Asperger's, Tourette's, Bipolar and More! Jessica Kingsley Publications, 2005.

Martinsen, H. & von Tetzchner, S., (1996). "Situating augmentative and alternative intervention." In von Tetzchner, S. & Jensen, M.H. (Eds.) Augmentative and Alternative Communication: European Perspectives, Whurr Publishers, Ltd. Pp.37-48. Hoskins, Barbara. Conversations: A Framework for Language Intervention, Thinking Publications, 1996.

Martinsen, H. & von Tetzchner, S., (1996). "Situating augmentative and alternative intervention." In von Tetzchner, S. & Jensen, M.H. (Eds.) Augmentative and Alternative Communication: European Perspectives, Whurr Publishers, Ltd. Pp.37-48.

Thompson, Sue. The Source for Nonverbal Learning Disorders, Linguistics, 1997.

Wiig, E., Secord, W., Glaser, A., Sotter, C. and Prendeville, J. Classroom Performance Assessment, Red Rock Educational Publications Inc, 2003.